Name: Stephen Paul Watson
Address: 101 Rainbow Drive #11203
Livingston, Texas, TX. 77399
Phone: 469-753-6945
Fax: E-Mail: stevepwats@gmail.com
In Pro Per

FILED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
08/15/2026
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY nth DEPUTY
DOCUMENT SUBMITTED THROUGH THE ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMISSION SYSTEM

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION

Stephen Paul Watson, Pro Se.

Plaintiff

v.

Kash Patel - Director at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Additional parties attachment form is attached.

Defendant(s).

CASE NUMBER:
2:26-cv-07725-CV-AJR
To be supplied by the Clerk of
The United States District Court

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, 13th, Fourteenth Amendments, APA (5 U.S.C. § 702, § 704, § 706)

COMES NOW Plaintiff, Stephen Watson seeks constitutional injunctive relief under general equity powers from the FBI, US IC where terrorist watchlisting, intermediate force (IFC), emerging technology like directed energy (DE) is causing irreparable harm.

HISTORY

1. Plaintiff's targeting began after posting to the internet about UFO's and has been on record about intermediate force targeting or directed energy (DE) to cause pain, surveillance abuse like

laptop/MacBook, smart phone interference with and family being targeted like Plaintiff's Mom and late Father who shared UFO ideas. A previous lawsuit in 2025 was attempted under Bivens against the DoJ, DoD, RTX corp. #2:25-cv-08341-CV-AJR but later dropped. Plaintiff was unsure about a legal remedy as a Pro Se but in light of new [direct] evidence Plaintiff is seeking injuctive relief under APA.

NOTICE OF CLAIM

2. Plaintiff complained to the pertinent authorities before proceeding with injunction request. A complaint was filed to the DoJ on July 3, 2025 - Ticket number 633041-JVD and got an acknowledgement response on January 24, 2026 but there was no follow up. The Plaintiff considers this an unreasonable delay response to a civil rights violation where irreparable harm is occurring. Other complaints to law enforcement or government are as follows: Azusa Police Department, LASD (referred Plaintiff to FBI so filed an online tip), US GAO (COMP-26-004186), DOJ Office of Inspector General (OIG), Justice Department Civil Rights Division,

#742221-QPK (does not meet jurisdiction response), Reseda Sheriff, Pasadena Police Department (does not meet criteria response), Phoenix, AZ Sheriff, Dallas, TX Sheriff, Carabinieri – Stazione Carabinieri – Lonate Pozzolo, Italy (about Father), Attorney General, Ventura Police Department abated response, California District Attorney, Reno Internal Affairs in Nevada, Los Angeles Internal Affairs Group, Malibu/Lost Hills Sheriff's Station, DoJ on July 3, 2025 - Ticket number 633041-JVD, Response January 24, 2026 on receiving complaint but no follow up. California Department of Social Services – Centralized Complaint and Information Bureau (about Mom). From 2014-2015 while living in New York Plaintiff tried contacting the FBI through the FBI electronic tip form, also hand delivered a complaint to the Jacob K Javits Federal Building to security addressed to FBI and got no response, DHS Federal Protective Service ran Plaintiff off outside because of holding a protest sign saying it upset Federal employees. DHS Trip Redress states only for No Fly List or having travel issues because of

of watchlistig in "Should I Use DHS TRIP" in Step 1 of applying. Traveler Redress Improvenment Act also offers no remedy. No grievance to contest intentional placement on the FBI's watchlist. i.e. KST File, non-investigative subject. A complaint to the US State Department on 'AHI's' because of directed energy diverts Plaintiff back to FBI who the Plaintiff is alleging are the likely perpetrators.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The court has subject matter jurisdiction because of US Constitution/ Federal Question/ Rule § 28 USC 1331 as ruled in Califano v Sanders (1977); government waves sovereign immunity or unlawful agency actions, like watchlisting Plaintiff, under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) waiver - 5 U.S.C. § 702, where Plaintiff is seeking equitable relief from the defense other than damages like injunctive relief due to irreparable harm caused by violating US constitution, Bill of Rights, the absence of pre-post deprivation, lack of a grievance process violating the Fifth Amendment. These actions by the defense are contrary to § 706(2)

constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity. Formal regulation, written policy, or final order, official agency decision, specific final agency action is vague due to a lack of transparency like watchlist, Task Forces activities not known to the public with the exception of old FOIA documents obtained by the ACLU, revealing a low standard of proof, unreliable data, lack of meaningful redress so Plaintiff is seeking non statutory right of action to enjoin unconstitutional agency conduct causing irreparable harm meeting standing requirement by federal officials; FBI, US IC acting in their official capacities under federal statute, federal question jurisdiction. In the Loper Bright Enterprises v Raimondo (2024) ruling gives a judge authority over Federal agencies like the FBI, Justice Department to interpret ambiguous Federal laws in court and meets 5 U.S.C. § 704 Final Agency Action. Venue in Federal Question is established where Cause of Action, a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred; where substantial physical/direct evidence in First Cause of Action and Second Cause of Action was

gathered by Plaintiff. In this case LA County, Central District of California, Western Division, and Notice of Claim to pertinent local, state, and Federal authorities occurred with no resolution or stoppage of alleged unconstitutional transgressions exhausting all avenues before proceeding with this injunction request where specific Federal Officer targets for injunctive decree, mass-party APA lawsuit, is in Attachment 1 and 2, are named in official capacity. Other parties are unknown like the FBI's Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena (UAP) Working Group that operates under the leadership of a designated national program manager not publicly disclosed and interagency in liaison with Pentagon's AARO.

UNLAWFUL AGENCY ACTIONS - 5. U.S.C. § 706(2).

4. Plaintiff alleges directed energy began after posting to the internet about UFO's where no crime was being committed but was targeted with intermediate force (IFC). Over time directed energy intermediate force capabilities (DE IFC), like in First Cause of Action, became a regular daily occurrence, like following a schedule

or part of a program, there was the impression of watchlisting during police stops, and other intermediate force like skin irritants placed in clothes, belongings, and interference with smart phone, laptop, pointing to the FBI's Task Force who are known for harassment according to the ACLU, since it occurs in different cities and states. The JTTF's core disruption activities as stated on the FBI's web site does not match anything the Plaintiff has ever done nor the National Counterintelligence Task Force core responsibilities on the FBI's web site so the Plaintiff can only conclude that his targeting in unlawful agency actions like selective enforcement. The US IC is affiliated with directed energy (DE), intermediate force capabilities (IFC), and UAP - See Attachment 1 and 2, where there is certainly the means and the motive to target Plaintiff and that of family like his Mother which violates Department of Justice Use of Force Policy, because it would not be objectively reasonable as ruled in Graham v Connor (1989). Mick West, science writer and video analyst debunked the Pentagon, Navy 'tic-tac' UAP footage as explainable

video artifacts, other footage appears to be mundane objects like birds, implying the Pentagon and Navy are being misleading. A Judicial Watch suit over FOIA on the Havana Syndrome; AHI's shows the DoJ, ODNI are not forthcoming about the Havana Syndrome or the use of directed energy pointing to unlawful (agency) actions substantiated in Plaintiff's Cause of Action.

STATE ACTION REQUIREMENT

There is strong circumstantial evidence that the Plaintiff's targeting could only be the US IC like DoJ, FBI, DoD, possibly NCIS, interagency collaboration at the FBI Task Forces and or affiliated US IC contractors into mass surveillance like targeting, tracking capabilities, terrorist watch listing, warrantless surveillance/ cyber/hacking, intermediate force capabilities (IFC) including emerging technology like directed energy (DE), irregular warfare, electronic warfare, what the FBI terms as "terrorist disruptions" without elaborating details according to FOIA attained by The Intercept and it could be no one else, not an individual stalker,

organized crime, or foreign espionage. As exemplified in Attachment 1 and 2 showing the US IC personnel into intermediate force (IFC), directed energy (DE), backdoor warrantless surveillance, and UAP where Plaintiff describes targeting over UFO speech. The DE weaponry like alleged in First and Second Cause of Action like a RF Active Denial weapon and LRAD points to the US authorities not civilians. The research arm of the Justice Department, the NIJ, tested the mmWave Assault Intervention Device (AID) with the desire to make it compact, solid-state (SS ADT) in the hands of law enforcement. It resulted in a lawsuit by a jailer, Andrew Lars Fuchs v LASD. The scope of the Plaintiff's targeting where similar evidence was gathered in different cities, states, target family members points to a Federal component. Other types of targeting are skin irritants that also points to intermediate force capabilities (IFC).

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

6. The Plaintiff compiled video evidence of directed energy that causes audible clicks recorded using a MacBook and pulses with a

pumping type effect recorded on a Vivitar Camera. At the time the Plaintiff was archiving his deceased Dad's UFO propulsion ideas, narrating his ideas for content creation. Plaintiff's targeting is strong when active online or making content about UFO's.

7. 06/07/26 = Plaintiff has RF meters in both hands showing reaction to clicks. No reaction on a Gauss meter that measures lower, non-RF frequencies. At Angeles National Forest. Video link: https://youtu.be/vrjhTdAnRDw

8. 05/16/26 = Bio-effects from stomach churning at 1:10 mark, audible clicks, and RF Meter reaction. Recorded on Vivitar Camera. Video link: https://youtu.be/EfWwsETb3aQ

9. 04/16/26 = Bio-effects from stomach churning at 06:20 mark, audible clicks, RF meter reaction. At Angeles National Forest. Video link: https://youtu.be/KMssVQYkDxs

10. Similar evidence was gathered In other parts of LA County like Santa Monica, Reseda where there were clicks or pulses with RF meter reaction, and bio-effects like stomach churning that can be

heard on the video and in different states like in Weatherford, Texas on 3/28/2026:

(https://youtu.be/_SR4qhG3vgE?si=ouBB4RiwsTUKl9k_)

showing a high probability of a Federal program/involvement, law enforcement involvement through Task Forces, capabilities such as to surveil, tracking, and the use of electronic warfare, emerging technology weapons like directed energy for targeting that is no small feat to hinder rights because government/ US IC doesn't like UFO research, ideas that is protected speech by Plaintiff violating FBI valid duty in protecting civil rights and government's valid duty to protect unalienable rights, safety, and liberties of its citizens that are here clearly being violated. The video evidence from 04/16/26, 05/16/26 has stomach churning as a result of use of force, directed energy weapons, maser weapons, that only government has like Active Denial, if by contractors it's a violation of broad discretion leading to unsafe execution or deviate from government precise specifications for physical abuse against Plaintiff to occur. As the

directed energy weapons for wanton of pain could be abused calling it tantamount to torture. Plaintiff's Cause of Action where direct evidence of a directed energy weapon was gathered on 04/16/26, 05/16/26, 06/07/26 while at Angeles Mountains in San Gabriel fits all the elements of battery and assault: intentional use of a weapon, an intentional tort, toward the Plaintiff, that was unconsented, harmful and offensive. There was a reasonable expectation of harm by unregulated weapons striking fear knowing audible clicks, pulses detected inside car that reacted to RF meters was from a maser weapon like Active Denial that was going to cause pain, bio-effects, also causing an intentional infliction of emotional distress, and is a violation of 18 U.S. Code § 113, since assault and battery offenses were committed on Federal land, on the dates 04/16/26, 05/16/26,06/07/26 when video evidence was gathered Plaintiff was parked at The Angeles National Forest managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Constitutional rights on the dates: 04/16/26, 05/16/26, 06/07/26 were also violated as follows:

11. First Amendment Violation - The Free Speech Clause: Using weapons, use of force, pain compliance methods on Plaintiff while using his laptop for content creation by overzealous Government, FBI Task Force for specific intent to hinder free speech, causing the chilling effect on speech activities.

12. Fourth Amendment Violation, Reasonableness Clause, Warrant Clause - When recording video evidence of Plaintiff's targeting there was interference like trying to prevent Plaintiff from recording. Plaintiff's laptop, a MacBook Air, also revs up and becomes hot like snooping, hacking, backdoor surveillance. In Riley v California (2014) a ruling that supports the Fourth Amendment where it is a violation to interfere with personal devices like a cell phone - in the Plaintiff's case a laptop used for recording. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) ruled FBI's "Backdoor Searches" Violated the Fourth Amendment using Section 702. The FBI must file "modest ministerial procedure" making the FBI's actions to interfere with Plaintiff's devices is Ultra Vires. The use of

intermediate force, wanton pain against Plaintiff over protected speech like UFO's because Government is paranoid, overzealous playing up UAP threats for spending is not objective unreasonable given the totality of the circumstances where Plaintiff's UFO speech did not cause public alarm or concern and can be compared to McCarthyism where citizens were targeted based on suspicion and goes against the ruling Graham v Connor, that requires courts to weigh in factors like the severity of a crime, immediate threat. There was no crime or tangible threat to justify use of force, intermediate force capabilities, a directed energy pain weapon against Plaintiff or his Mother. Government made 'unidentified' a threat in UAP where it is not clearly defined and vague. The FBI placing the Plaintiff on a terrorist watchlist over UFO's would be considered arbitrary and capricious, overzealous, opportune.

13. Fifth Amendment, Due Process Clause. The Plaintiff was not afforded due process; pre post deprivation by the government like using unconstitutional terrorist watch-listing to use force, weapons

on him to inflict pain, pain compliance, all the elements of assault, battery like intentional act, un-consented, a gesture of intimidation/ immediate threat; resulting in a causation of harm, irreparable harm violating his rights, free speech - a clear violation of the Fifth Amendment, as a Federal judge ruled in Elhady v. Kable, that the terrorist watchlisting process by FBI is unconstitutional with no real redress where No-Fly in TSA redress only covers travel issues.

14. Ninth Amendment, Unenumerated Rights. The use of directed energy to immobilizing a person, to cause the "chilling effect" on free speech, free will is potentially a violation of other unenumerated rights. The same method can be used as prejudicial compliance against the exercise of other rights like voting, working, and violated the Plaintiff's right to privacy, bodily autonomy by perpetrators using emerging weapon technology, directed energy to target body affecting gut health causing bio-effects where stomach churning can be heard in video evidence. Bio-effects is also observed in loose stool affecting digestive health. Natural biological functions for good

health are interfered with by overzealous Government using a weapon, aiming directed energy at people, being trigger happy with weapons, lacking self-control, getting carried away with weapons capabilities, sadistic behavior that can be compared to Abu Grahib prisoner abuse torture like the ruling Shimari v CACI - a clear reckless abuse of power that is brutality and irrational.

15. Thirteenth Amendment, Involuntary Servitude. These are not isolated incidents like in stalking, technology-facilitated abuse. The Plaintiff's targeting is a regular occurrence where Feds, contractors are on a payroll, like the Plaintiff is involuntary servitude to weapons development and techno-slavery, the signs of slavery because of a lack of autonomy, continual tracking, and the infliction of corporal wanton type punishment, now seen as barbaric, as in the cruel treatment of slaves - a violation of the 13th Amendment - involuntary servitude. Plaintiff nor targeted family like his Mother ever gave informed consent to being weapon test subjects; weapons slaves.

16. 14th Amendment Violation, Equal Protection Clause - to

disadvantage discourse based on viewpoints is viewpoint discrimination and a violating equal protection.

17. APA Violation (5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)). The FBI placing the Plaintiff on a terrorist watchlist over UFO's for discriminatory selective enforcement would be considered arbitrary and capricious. Plaintiff described warrantless surveillance like interfering with devices which is Ultra Vires using FISA Section 702 as ruled by the The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) on FBI's "Backdoor Searches" violating "modest ministerial procedure." The FBI violating valid duty to to protect unalienable rights and has a propensity for violating civil rights. If contractors are involved the actions are objectively unreasonable and broad discretion, unsafe execution like being trigger happy, reckless, deliberate indifference, like in Shimari v CACI abuse ruling involving a PIA/Fed Contractor.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

18. On 04/03/2024 at 11:54 PM while parked at the Target store lot in Azusa, California, the Plaintiff was targeted with a directed

sound device believed to be from the FBI's Task Force while using Wi-Fi and a high pitched tone could be heard panning back and forth in both ears. i.e. a psychoacoustic sensation. It was loud, nothing subtle like outside noise or a loud sound coming from a vehicle. The sound appeared to be controlled by technology to create the panning effect. Plaintiff recorded video using his laptop (https://youtu.be/J9Gl6FWNCog; https://youtu.be blP_2SgA4VY) microphone to record the audio and could hear a tone by amplifying/ filtering the audio. It is believed a directed sound device like LRAD was used. According to articles the panning stereo effect is a directional "flashlight" beam. LASD and law enforcement has access to this technology and very unlikely LRAD was used against Plaintiff by a civilian. This would be an intentional tort fitting all the elements of battery, assault with a weapon causing fear; an expectation of harm because LRAD can cause hearing damage. It goes against police public duty doctrine since a person being targeted with a sound weapon causing fright may cause fight or flight causing them

to drive away fast hitting a pedestrian shopper in a parking lot or causing an accident. LRAD is used to disperse rioters there is no need to use it against a person, like the Plaintiff, sitting in his car, bothering no one at a busy store parking lot that points to carless, deliberate indifference and potential negligence through causation. Use of force was being used by the defense, like the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force, for specific intent, to discourage the Plaintiff from using the Wi-Fi for free speech, posting online. Government and the FBI have a valid duty to protect intangible rights like free speech and civil liberties and not violate them using force that was not proportionate to any threat the Plaintiff posed causing intangible harm like psychological/emotional harm; loss of civil liberty. If Fed contractors were involved this would be a broad discretion leading to unsafe execution and deviate from government precise specifications in violating valid duty where contractor is the instigator in abuse, conspiracy to commit torture, illegal conduct as a jury found in Shimari v CACI. Constitutional rights violated in Cause of

Action on 04/03/2024 were:

19. First Amendment violation - The Free Speech Clause - the chilling effect, to specific intent disadvantage speakers based on viewpoints by targeting using weapons like LRAD.

20. Fourth Amendment Violation, Reasonableness Clause, Warrant Clause - objectively unreasonable to interfere with device/ using Wi-Fi.

21. Fifth Amendment Violation, Due Process Clause - not afforded due process, a grievance process, pre post deprivation.

22. Ninth Amendment Violation. Unenumerated rights. Plaintiff's right to bodily autonomy was violated by using the the LRAD psychoacoustic effect for sensory overload/deprivation, breaking a targeted citizens psychological defenses, comparable to torture tactics used at Gtimo; extraordinary rendition; the 2014 Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) describing Gitmo torture tactics.

23. 14th Amendment Violation. Violating equal protection

safeguard, to disadvantage discourse based on viewpoints is viewpoint discrimination and a violating equal protection.

24. APA Violations (5 U.S.C. § 706). The FBI placing the Plaintiff on a terrorist watchlist over UFO's for discriminatory selective enforcement to use intermediate force like LRAD through Task Forces would be considered arbitrary and capricious. FBI JTTF actions violate valid duty to protect unalienable rights where UFO speech is null as a viable terrorist threat and questionable as national security since Plaintiff does not have access to classified information or secret files. Using a weapon, intermediate force capabilities (IFC) to discourage Wi-Fi usage is Ultra Vires. The FBI's JTTF employs a preventative model for counterterrorism or counterintelligence but predicting someone's speech may be harmful while discouraging access to Wi-Fi using a weapon is objectively unreasonable, broad discretion, where there is deliberate indifference to causation in a busy store parking lot with shoppers not knowing how the Plaintiff will react violating police public duty

doctrine to protect the public.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

25. The Plaintiff puts forth five core elements for a Judge to grant a Temporary Restaining Order, Preliminary, and Permanent injunctive relief under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C), "hold unlawful and set aside" terrorist watchlisting and agency actions that goes against objectively reasonable 1-16.000 Use of Force, policy by the DoJ:

1) Strong factual evidence, direct evidence like video showing there are physical effects like in the First Cause of Action where there are audible sounds as a result of DE weaponry, while simultaneously causing RF Meters to react and bio-effects like the sound of the stomach churning - not normal conditions inside a car making it more likely than not it is something external like an alleged RF weapon aimed at the Plaintiff who is targeted because of watchlisting. Other evidence like witness testimony, a letter from Plaintiff's Mom describing electric pestering that comes and goes and substantiates Plaintiff's allegation of FBI harassment, a directed

2) Irreparable harm: Plaintiff's Constitutional rights were violated causing irreparable harm. These intangible rights are unique and the loss of Plaintiff's freedoms, like free speech, expression of ideas, even for a short time, cannot be fully compensated with money or restored. There's also the expectation of harm causing emotional distress (IIED), worrying bio-effects; health effects, that do not conform to AFRL/ military bio-effect studies where there has been an increase in the frequency, intensity of the targeting, in recent years that seemed like broad discretion, unsafe execution like negligent infliction of emotional distress (NIED). Terrorist Watch-Listing violates the Plaintiff's Fifth Amendment rights of due process, lacking any real grievance process, pre post deprivation where Plaintiff should have never been watchlisted in the first place over protected speech like UFO's - this is not objective reasonableness and clear opportune overzealous behavior - 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)(A).

3). Balances of Hardships: Injunction will alleviate Plaintiff's hardship and that of targeted family like Plaintiff's Mother while

the defense who are the FBI, government will not be effected. The FBI's targets change and pivot because of politics. The DoJ has been is no exception criticized as political. UFO's has been politicized by the Government as UAP and not out of concern by the public but from government opportunism. Removing the Plaintiff's name from the watchlist will not harm the FBI and will restore Plaintiff's rights - "To protect [the right to be left alone]," 4th Amndt.

4). Public Interest: Protecting the public from civil rights violations like violating the Frist, Fifth Amendment etc. and actions not in accordance of law is in the public interest. e.g. UFO's are protected speech. There is no law prohibiting speech on UFO/UAP topics from being discussed. Everyone should be afforded pre post deprivation and a proper grievance process; due process. A system of checks and balances is a remedy for government overreach, tyranny, benefiting the public at large.

5). Lack of an Adequate Remedy at Law: Under 5 U.S. Code § 704 catch all where there is no remedy to Plaintiff's alleged

transgressions involving terrorist watchlisting and intermediate force wanton of pain infliction, not only toward Plaintiff but Plaintiff's family, this permits judicial review of final agency actions. The Plaintiff's intermediate force targeting can be compared to similar Federal laws like against lasers 18 U.S. Code § 39A and CA Penal Code Section 417.25 that show a propensity for laser abuse, where the button pusher gets a rush, adulation aiming a weapon, the sort of irrational behavior that can get out of hand, and the FDA banning ESD: Electrical Stimulation Devices for Self-Injurious or Aggressive Behavior, FDA 85 FR 13312 that cite pain and psychological suffering as reason for ban, should be considered in granting the Plaintiff's request for injunction since there are similarities to Plaintiff's targeting and that of family. Emerging technologies like directed energy is a [legal] gray zone according to the Pentagon and lack legal framework according to the UN Office of Disarmament Affairs. Without proper regulation, laws, statutes, oversight in order to prevent DEW abuse by the authorities, FBI Task Forces that have

a propensity to harass according to ACLU, law enforcement has a propensity for police brutality, and hired hand, Fed contractors (PIA's) that lack oversight where abuse, torture can occur as in the recent ruling, Al Shimari v CACI, found. The US IC like ODNI is not forthcoming about he Havana Syndrome (AHI's) as a recent Judicial Watch, Inc v. US Department of Justice et al. (No. 1:26-cv-01702) FOIA suit claims, and legislation like the HAVANA Act that only supports current and former government employees. The LASD and State Department referred Plaintiff back to the FBI who the Plaintiff determined are the likely perpetrators using intermediate force for disruption, discrediting, or entrapment because of Plaintiff's free speech on UFO topics. This violates Department of Justice Policy on Use of Force because Plaintiff's targeting is not objectively reasonable. Therefore do to irreparable harm and a lack of remedy by law the Plaintiff request mandatory or injunctive decrees, that are non-monetary, 5 U.S.C. 702, where the United States is a defendant to halt or correct unlawful agency actions § 706, like watchlisting

over UFO's, where DHS TRIP is not an adequate remedy, redress in removing the Plaintiff's name from Terrorist Screening Center (TSC), due process violations, a lack of meaningful way to challenge placement, when Plaintiff is not a terrorist but just exercising protected speech that Government retaliates against because of UAP alarmism bureaucracy, where such actions are Arbitrary and Capricious, under 5 U.S.C. § 706 (2)(A), and 5 U.S.C. 702 injunctive decree personal accountability as stated on specific federal officer list in official capacity on Attachment 1 & 2. Injunction (Preliminary, (Permanent) is not only for the Plaintiff, Stephen Paul Watson, but also for family: Karen Ann Day (mother) who lives at a residential care home in the Yucca Valley and should also be granted a Temporary Restraining Order against the defense. Also injunction (Preliminary, Permanent) should be granted for Plaintiff's siblings: Alice, Teresa, Esther, Christa Watson since there is targeted family where US IC shows propensity as described in the 2014 Senate Committee on Intelligence (SSCI). Plaintiff argues the cop-out

excuse of using state secrecy privilege by defense is not applicable by using watchlisting for intentional tort abuse (wrongs), IFC, emerging technology like directed energy as evidence in Cause of Action 1, show the stomach churning where there is physical, degrading abuse (a tort) affecting health, as the appellant court ruled against the state secrecy defense in Al Shimari v CACI prisoner abuse. Plaintiff's speech and that of his now deceased Father (Gene Watson - Flying Saucers book (2014)) was protected speech where there was retaliation of speech not classified in nature or exposing military activities, US IC people/operations so state secrecy privilege should not apply if used by the defense. The Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family should be granted injunction against the defense who try to get away with abuse (wrongs) out of the public's eye or through secrecy.

Date: AMEND -SW August 15, 2026 ~~JULY 29, 2026~~

Stephen P. Watson, Pro Se.

Attachment 1

Specific Federal Officer List for Injunctive Decree in Official Capacity

FBI

1. Kash Patel - FBI and FBI's NSB Director
2. Michael Glasheen - Director of the Threat Screening Center (TSC) at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
3. David J. Scott - Assistant Director Counterterrorism Division at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
4. Don Holstead - Assistant Director of the Counterterrorism Division at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
5. Kevin Vorndran - Assistant Director of the Counterintelligence Division at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
6. Roman Rozhavsky - National Counterintelligence Task Force (NCITF) at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
7. Sean T Ryan, assistant director of FBI's operational technology Department of Justice (DoJ);

DNI

8. Joseph Weirsky - Acting Director, National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI);
9. George Wes Street - Director of the National Counterintelligence Security Center (NCSC) to the Director of National Intelligence (DNI);
10. Jay Clayton Director of National Intelligence (DNI);

DOJ

11. Matthew F. Blue - Chief of the counterterrorism section, National Security Division, at the United States Department of Justice (DoJ).
12. John A. Eisenberg Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, at the United States Department of Justice (DoJ);
13. Christian Nauvel - DOJ Export Control (CES)

Attachment 2

Specific Federal Officer List for
Injunctive Decree in Official Capacity

NIJ

14. Jennifer Scherer - Director National Institute of Justice (NIJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), at the United States Department of Justice (DoJ);

15. Dr. Mark Green - National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Office of Technology and Standards, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), at the United States Department of Justice (DoJ);

DHS

16. Matthew Kozma - DHS Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis (I&A)

USAF

17. Stephanie Miller - Bioeffects Division, Air Force Research Laboratory, The United States Department of the Air Force;

DoD/Pentagon

18. Lieutenant Colonel Craig Warner - Director of the Joint Intermediate Force Capabilities Office (JIFCO) at the Department of War;

19. John Kosloski - All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office (AARO) at the U.S. Department of War;

NAVY

20. Omar L Lopez - Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) t the Department of the Navy;